

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 12-14, 16 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) over Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent 6,731,358). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The instant claims, as exemplified in the disclosure, have color filters units thinner than adjacent transparent layers. For example, instant Fig. 3D shows that the layer 10 is twice as thick as the color filter 34 (dimensions at page 8, line 9 and page 9, line 6). This keeps the color filter thin, which is advantageous for optical reasons (increasing cell transmittance), while at the same time making the filter/transparent layer sandwich thick, which is advantageous for electrical reasons (reducing capacitance). The Examiner is referred to page 2, line 25 to page 3, line 2.

Tanaka discloses a “flatted layer” 8 which is transparent (col. 5, line 23) and is 0.8  $\mu\text{m}$  thick (col. 6, line 18); a color filter layer 9 which is 1.5  $\mu\text{m}$  thick (col. 6, lines 33, 43, and 47); and a protection film 10 which is 0.3  $\mu\text{m}$  thick (col. 6, line 53). In Tanaka, the filter is thicker than either (or both) layers 8 and 10.

Independent claim 1 as now amended recites a color filter approximately 1.0  $\mu\text{m}$  thick, which is less than the 1.5  $\mu\text{m}$ -thick color filter of Tanaka. Therefore, Tanaka does not anticipate. Claims 14-16 and 25 also recite this feature and likewise distinguish. The claims depending from these claims are allowable by their dependence, and also for reciting features not disclosed in the references.

Claims 1-2, 11-13, 15, 25-26 and 32-33 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) over Nakata et al. (U.S. Patent 6,429,916). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nakata discloses color filters (red 13a, green 13b, and blue 13c) that are 1.2  $\mu\text{m}$  thick (col. 3, lines 31, 55, and 64), which is greater than the claimed thicknesses. Thus, Nakata does not anticipate.

Claims 5-11 and 17-23 were rejected under USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Gu et al (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,011,274 and 5,955,744). This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis of dependence from an allowable claim.

Claims 6-10 and 27-31 were rejected under USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata et al. in view of the same two Gu patents. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis of dependence from an allowable claim.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

May 24, 2005

Date



Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)

**(717) 426-1664**

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.

CUSTOMER NO. 23995

Telephone: (202) 371-8976

Telefax : (202) 408-0924